WYOMING SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY

WYOMING SCHOOL PERFORMANCE RATING MODEL 2014

IMPLEMENTATION HANDBOOK

(October 7, 2014)

The Wyoming School Accountability pilot was implemented during the fall of 2013. This paragraph pertains to the pilot. The Wyoming Accountability in Education Act (WAEA) established a requirement to develop procedures for assigning all Wyoming public schools to one of four performance level categories: *Exceeding Expectations, Meeting Expectations, Partially Meeting Expectations* and *Not Meeting Expectations.* Each school's performance level determination was based upon the school's performance on various indicators that were prescribed by statute. The methodology for evaluating each schools performance on the indicators was established in accordance with the January, 2012, *Education Accountability Report*[1]. A professional judgment panel (PJP) composed of Wyoming stakeholders as prescribed by statute engaged in a standard setting process to establish cut-scores and other parameters for a school performance rating model. The PJP met on September 16, 17, and 18, 2013 and the pilot school performance levels reflected the decisions made by that panel. The school performance levels and school scores on the indicators were vetted with districts and publically released during October 2013.

This handbook describes the 2014 operational implementation of Wyoming School Accountability. Lessons learned during the pilot and the availability of additional data in 2013-14 resulted in some changes to the school performance rating model to be implemented in 2014. Those changes are documented where appropriate in this *Implementation Handbook.*

ROLE OF THE PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT PANEL

Some of the decisions made by the PJP during the 2012-13 pilot were not addressed again in 2013-14. Where changes were made to the model or changes to the assessments or other data, the PJP established the index values, weights and cut-points included in this manual.

INDICATORS BY GRADE

Indicators are a function of grade in school.

- Indicators for Schools that have Grades Three through Grade Eight
    - Achievement
    - Growth
    - Equity measured by growth
- Indicators for High School

[1] Marion, S. & Domaleski, C. (2012). *The Wyoming Comprehensive Accountability Framework: Phase I.* Produced for the Wyoming Select Committee on Statewide Education Accountability.

- Achievement
- Readiness
- Equity measured by change in the achievement gap

Some schools have grade configurations that include both grades nine through 12 and grades eight and lower (e.g., schools with grades K-12). These schools will have two school performance levels computed initially; one for grades eight and below and one for grades nine through 12. The school will receive two reports (i.e., a grade 3-8 report and a high school report). The school's official performance level will be the lower of the two computed performance levels.

INDICATORS AND INDICATOR SCORES

ACHIEVEMENT

There will be one overall *school achievement score* for each school that represents student performance on the state assessment in all tested grades and content areas at each school. The Grade 3 through 8 and the high school achievement indicators will be different. The 2013-14 achievement tests used for state accountability will include:

- The Proficiency Assessment for Wyoming Students (PAWS)
  - Reading in grades 3 through 8
  - Math in grades 3 through 8
  - Science in grades 4 and 8
  - Writing in grades 5 and 7
- The ACT subject area tests of:
  - Reading in grade 11
  - Mathematics in grade 11
  - Science in grade 11
  - Combined English/Writing in grade 11

Achievement. The achievement indicator for schools was the percent of proficient or above test scores on the Wyoming state achievement tests[2]. An illustration of how school achievement scores will be computed is presented in Table 1. Assume the hypothetical school represented in Table 1 was an elementary school with grades kindergarten through six with 20 students per grade level. Science will only be tested in grade 4 at this school. Because fewer students were tested in science, exceptionally high or low performance on the science test would have less impact on the school achievement score than would exceptionally high or low performance on either the reading tests or the math tests[3].

[2]During the summer of 2014 ACT staff assisted WDE staff in establishing cut-points for student performance levels on the ACT subject area tests that are appropriate for use in school accountability.

[3] Weighting for different tested content areas will be a function of the number of students taking a test in each content area. This weighting reflects the policy maker decisions about which grade-by-content areas to test. For example, when federal and state policy makers required testing in reading and math in seven grades but they required testing in science in just three grades they suggested the weights reflected in this rating model. As a result, more students take reading and math tests than science test and reading and math will carry more weight on the achievement indicator than science.

Table 1. Illustration of Computation of a School Achievement Score.

Content	Count of Tested Students	Count of Proficient Students	School Achievement Score
Math	80	65	
Reading	80	60	
Writing	40	25	
Science	20	12	
Column Totals	220	162	162/220 = 73.6%

This school achievement score (i.e., the total percent proficient on all achievement tests) was used for assigning schools to one of three categories on the achievement indicator using cut points established by the PJP:

- For grades three through eight achievement indicator
  - Meets Target Cut Point = 53
  - Exceeds Target Cut Point = 70
- For high school achievement indicator
  - Meets Target Cut Point = 32
  - Exceeds Target Cut Point = 45

EQUITY

An important goal of WAEA is to "minimize achievement gaps" [Wyoming Statute 21-2-204(b)(vi)].

Equity for Schools Serving Grades 4 through 8. A consolidated subgroup was established that consisted of all students who were below proficient on the prior year state test in math and/or reading. Because the previous year's test performance defines this group, educators know who is in this group at the beginning of each new school year. This will permit educators to be strategic about planning to improve outcomes for students in this subgroup.

In order to align the 2014 test with the recently revised Wyoming Content Standards for English/language arts and mathematics, Wyoming aligned all items on the 2014 PAWS test with the new standards and developed a new scale to go along with those standards. When a test moves from one scale to another it is still possible to compute normative growth scores like student growth percentiles (SGPs). As such, Wyoming will include growth in the school performance ratings in 2014. When there is a break in scales, however, it is generally not possible to compute adequate growth percentile rank (AGP) scores which are based upon projections from the prior year's test to current and future tests. In 2013, AGPs were central to the measurement of the equity score for schools with grades four through eight. An alternative method for computing equity will be needed in 2014 to address this break in scale on the PAWS test. The alternative method was based upon student standardized scores. The correlation

coefficient for equity scores computed using the 2013 method and the equity scores computed using the proposed 2014 method was $r = .80$[4].

PAWS scaled scores have different means and standard deviations for each grade within each content area. In order to measure equity in the absence of AGPs we needed express how the overall consolidated subgroup performed in reading and math. A student standardized score is a transformation of a PAWS scaled score that has a common mean and standard deviation[5] for all content areas and grades. A mean student standardized score for a consolidated subgroup expressed how much that group's reading and math performance differed from that of all students in the state of Wyoming. To assist with computing equity scores for 2014 school performance ratings, a standardized scale for the student scores in reading and math was computed with the statewide Wyoming mean set to equal 100 and the statewide standard deviation set to be equal to 20. *Each school's equity score was the consolidated subgroups mean student standardized score in reading and math combined.*

The student standardized scores used here tell us how much each student's score differed from the statewide mean for their grade level. The scale had a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 20. If a student had a score of 110 that would indicate the student performed 50% of a standard deviation above the statewide mean score.

The PJP established the following cut points for use in placing each school into one of three target level categories for below target, meeting target and exceeding target.

- For grades four through eight equity indicator
    - Meets Target Cut Point = 80
    - Exceeds Target Cut Point = 85

Equity for High Schools. Issue 30 of the *WDE Assessment Updates* informed schools in Wyoming that the high school equity indicator for 2013-14 would include a consolidated subgroup. Current year (i.e., 2013-14) grade 11 students were in grade 10 last year (i.e., 2012-13) when they were required to take the PLAN test. Membership in the consolidated subgroup for high school was based upon 2012-13 PLAN test performance on the subject area tests of mathematics and reading. Students with scaled scores below 17 on the mathematics subject area test and/or below 16 on the reading subject area tests were placed in the consolidated subgroup for their respective high schools.

The high school equity score was a measure of the achievement level of the consolidated subgroup's combined reading and math achievement at the end of grade 11 (i.e., the current school year). Keep in mind that these students were identified as low performing students based upon their low performance in either reading or math or both reading and math at the end of grade 10 (i.e., the prior school year). The equity score for high schools was the mean score of the consolidated subgroup in reading and math from the end of grade 11. The mean used was the mean *Wyoming ACT scaled score*.

[4] see Flicek (2013). Wyoming school accountability: Proposed 2013-14 high school equity indicator.
[5] This is accomplished by producing a norm-referenced score.

The PJP established the following cut points for use in placing each high school into one of three target level categories for below target, meeting target and exceeding target.

- For high school equity indicator
    - Meets Target Cut Point = 120
    - Exceeds Target Cut Point = 127

GROWTH

Student Level Growth. Growth was measured in schools serving grades 4 through 8 only. Growth refers to a change in the achievement within students as they progress from year to year. In order to compute growth scores, students must have at least two consecutive years of state test scores. Since the Wyoming state test is first administered in grade three, growth is first measured in grade four. Growth is computed separately for reading and for math on the Wyoming state test for students in grades four through eight.

The method used to measure growth produced student growth percentiles[6] (SGPs) that indicated how an individual student's growth compared with that of all Wyoming public school students[7] from that particular year in the same grade who had similar scores in previous years. Students in the same grade with a similar test history may be referred to as a student's academic peers. SGPs range from 1 to 99 with lower scores indicating lower growth and higher scores indicating higher growth relative to the academic peers. This measure of growth is independent of the prior achievement level performance of students[8]. Students with low achievement may have low or high growth. Likewise, students with high achievement may have low or high growth. Regardless of how high a student's test scores in past years were, they still may earn any of the SGPs from 1 to 99 depending upon the changes in their scaled scores.

Students Included in the Growth Modeling Data Set. Only public school students were included in the SGP norm cohort for a given year. . The data set for the current year public school students with all of their prior public school scores included.

School Level Growth. The median SGP at a school (i.e., the school's MGP) is the SGP that half of the students at the school scored above and half scored below. MGPs have the same meaning for any group. As such, they can be computed separately for each grade and content area at a school. Separate MGPs for each grade and content area at a school will be computed and reported to assist schools with their improvement efforts. The most accurate median that represents total growth at a school across all grades and both content areas, however, is the median of SGPs (i.e., the MGP).. That *school MGP* was used as the school's growth score.

---

[6] See Betebenner, D. W. (2008). *Norm- and criterion-referenced student growth.* Available at http://www.nciea.org.

[7] Some private school and home school students take the PAWS test. If these students are not enrolled in a public school at the time of the testing, their score will not be included in the norm sample. If they enroll in a public school the following year and take the PAWS test, their previous PAWS test scores will be used to compute growth.

[8] Correlation coefficients for prior achievement with SGPs at the student level in Wyoming were all very near $r = 0.00$.

MGPs at each school will further be placed into one of three categories: (a) below target, (b) meeting target and (c) exceeding target. The PJP established the following cut points for the MGPs in September 2013 that separated these three categories from one another. The same cut points were used in 2014.

The growth cut points for grades four through eight growth indicator were:

- Meets Target Cut Point = 45
- Exceeding Target Cut Point = 60

READINESS

High School Readiness Indicator. Readiness was measured at all high schools (i.e., schools from which students may earn a high school diploma). There were four sub-indicators for readiness in 2014. In 2013 only two of these sub-indicators were available.

- Graduation rate
- Tested readiness as measured on tests in the ACT suite of tests (i.e., ACT Explore in grade 9, ACT Plan in grade 10 and the ACT in grade 11)
- Grade nine credits earned
- Graduates' eligibility level for the Hathaway Scholarship

Graduation Rate. Graduation rate will be featured more prominently than the other three readiness sub-indicators. A goal of WAEA is for Wyoming to become an education leader among states. Clearly, a state that is an education leader among states would be among the top states for high school graduation rate. The current evidence suggests that Wyoming is not presently among the top states for high school graduation.

Specifically, the most recent graduation rate information for states available from the US Department of Education (USED) is from the 2009-10 school year. During the past four years Wyoming and other states have been measuring four year on-time graduation rates. Wyoming's four year on-time graduation rate on that report was listed as 80%. 61% of the states at that time had four year on-time graduation rates above 80%. Wyoming has experienced a drop in four year on-time graduation each of the last three years. Wyoming's graduation rates for these years are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2.Wyoming Four Year On-Time Graduation Rates.

School Year	Four Year On-Time Graduation Rate
2012-13	77.5
2011-12	78.9
2010-11	79.7
2009-10	80.4

In order to place more prominence on the graduation rate sub-indicator, the method used in 2014 had school level targets identified by the PJP that are specific to graduation rate. A graduation rate cut point for *meeting* a graduation rate target and a cut point for *exceeding* a graduation rate

target were identified by the PJP. These targets will guide school efforts to improve graduation rates going forward.

Graduation rate computation was a multi-step process.

Step 1. The PJP established graduation rate targets.

- For high school graduation rate readiness sub-indicator
  - Meets Target Cut Point = 80
  - Exceeds Target Cut Point = 90

Step 2. The degree to which the schools met the *graduation rate targets* with the four year on-time graduation rate and/or with the extended graduation rate were determined.

- The school's four year on-time graduation rate was computed as follows:

4 year adjusted cohort graduation rate =	Number of four year on-time cohort members who earned a regular high school diploma by the end of the graduation year
	Number of first-time 9th graders in the fall of the school year 4 years prior to the graduation year (starting year) plus students who transfer in, minus students who transfer out, emigrate, or die prior to the graduation year

  - The denominator is the total of all four year on-time cohort members from a school over a 4 year period for a grade cohort. The denominator includes 9th grade drop-outs from 3 years ago, the 10th grade drop-outs from 2 years ago, 11th grade drop-outs from last year, and the graduation year's 12th grade drop-outs plus completers. These were all the students in the cohort as described in the above formula. The numerator was the count of the cohort's current year regular diploma recipients. This four year on-time rate answers the question, "What percent of students in the cohort exit education within four years with a regular diploma?" Foreign exchange students are not included in either the numerator or the denominator.
  - Each school will fall within one of three categories for the 4 year on-time (i.e., exceed, meet or *not meet* the target) based upon their four year on-time graduation rate.
- Next, the school's extended graduation rate was computed
  - The extended graduation rate was the four year on-time graduation rate with all 5, 6 and 7 year graduates from the school added to both the numerator and the denominator.
  - Each school will also be placed into an *exceeding, meeting* or *below* target category based upon the extended graduation rate.

Step 3. Determine the degree to which the schools' *progress toward the target* indicates the school is on track to meet the target within three years.

- For all high schools in the "not meet" category based upon the four year on-time graduation rate or the extended graduation rate, a school target for progress on the four year on-time graduation rate from the prior year to current year was computed. This school target was based on a reduction in the gap by one third from the prior year.
    - For example, assume a school has a graduation rate of 74% and the meets target rate was 80%
        - Calculate the amount of growth needed to be considered on track to meet the target within three years (round this to the nearest tenth)
        - If the target was 80% and the school's prior year four year on-time graduation rate was 74% then,
            - (80) - (74) = 6
            - (6) x (.333) = 2.0
            - (2.0) + (74) = 76.0
        - If the school's four year on-time graduation rate for the current year was at least 76.0 the school would have made satisfactory progress and would be placed in the "meets" category based on meeting the target on the progress indicator.
        - If the school's four year on-time graduation rate for the current year was below 76.0 in the current year, the school would remain in the "below" target category.
    - Similarly, for schools that were in the "meets" target category with their four year on-time or extended graduation rate, progress was measured toward the "exceeds" target category using the same methodology described above
        - If progress was sufficient to indicate the school was on-track to meet the "exceed" category, the school is classified as "exceeds" on the progress indicator
        - If progress is not sufficient, the school will remain in the "meets" target category on the progress indicator

Step 4.The school is placed into the higher category of either status (i.e., attainment of target with either the four year on-time graduation rate or the extended graduation rate) or progress (i.e., improvement to target).

Additional Readiness. The remaining three readiness sub-indicators (i.e., tested readiness, grade nine credits and Hathaway eligibility level) were grouped together and one combined score was computed to reflect performance on these three sub-indicators. This combined score is called the *additional readiness* score. When computing the additional readiness score, the PJP recommended differential weighting for the three sub-indicators scores that were combined into the other readiness score. The PJP also identified cut scores for *meeting* and *exceeding* targets on the *additional readiness* score.

Some schools met the minimum *n* requirement for one or more additional readiness sub-indicators but not all additional readiness sub-indicators. When this happened, the additional readiness score was computed using just those indicators on which the school met the minimum

n requirement. This score was computed for all schools in the sample with the needed scores that met the minimum *n* on those indicators. Cut-scores were established on these partial additional readiness scores by assuring that the proportion of schools exceeding, meeting and below targets on the partial readiness score were as close as possible to the proportion of schools within each category for all three additional readiness sub-indicators when the PJP established cut-points were applied to those schools. The partial additional readiness scores had proportional weighting based upon their three sub-indicators weights. For example, if a school met the minimum *n* the tested readiness and grade nine credits but not on Hathaway eligibility and tested readiness was weighted at .30 and grade nine credits was weighted at .30, the proportional weights applied to the partial additional readiness scores was .50 for tested readiness and .50 for grade 9 credits.

ACT Suite of Readiness Tests. Tested readiness remained unchanged from the 2013 pilot. Composite scores on the ACT Explore in the spring of grade nine, the ACT Plan in the spring of grade ten and the ACT in the spring of grade 11 provided test evidence of readiness. The index developed and used during the pilot for each of the three tests was used in computing the measure of tested readiness. ACT composite test scores are presently used in Wyoming as one source of information that determines a student's level of eligibility for Hathaway Scholarships. The ACT composite score cut points used for Hathaway Scholarship eligibility informed the development of the Wyoming accountability tested readiness index. Specifically the ACT composite cut point for the lowest level of Hathaway Scholarship eligibility became the lowest cut point for the readiness index. The ACT composite cut point for the highest level of Hathaway Scholarship eligibility became the highest cut point for the readiness index. Finally, an ACT composite cut point for a middle level of Hathaway Scholarship eligibility became the middle cut point for the readiness index. Table 3 presents the ACT composite score ranges and associated accountability index values that resulted from this process.

Table 3. ACT College Readiness Index Score Ranges.

Wyoming Tested Readiness Levels	Composite Score Ranges			Index Points*
	ACT Explore Grade 9	ACT Plan Grade 10	ACT Test Grade 11	
Level 4	21-25	22-32	25-36	100
Level 3	18-20	19-21	21-24	80
Level 2	15-17	16-18	17-20	50
Level 1	1-14	1-15	1-16	20

*The index points associated with each level were established by the PJP in September, 2013.

Table 4.9 in *Technical Manual Plan* provided observed ACT scores from fall of grade 12 for students who also had Plan scores from spring of grade ten. The frequency distributions from this matrix of scores were used to identify the score point on the Plan that was a mid point in the score range associated with the ACT cut points represented in Table 4 above. The Plan score ranges in Table 4 were constructed using those corresponding Plan composite scores as cut points.

Finally, Table 4.19 of the *Technical Manual Explore* provides observed Plan composite scores from fall of grade 10 for students who also had Explore scores from the spring of grade nine. The

frequency distributions from this matrix of scores were used to identify the score point on the Explore that were a mid point in the score range associated with the Plan cut points represented in Table 3 above. The Explore score ranges in Table 4 above were constructed using those corresponding Explore cut points.

In order to better understand the extent of coherence across the tested readiness index score ranges on the three tests, the percentages of students scoring at each level on each test in Wyoming in 2013 were computed. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Percent of Wyoming Students with Scores at Each Tested Readiness Level in 2013.

Wyoming Tested Readiness Levels	ACT Explore (Grade 9)	ACT Plan (Grade 10)	ACT (Grade 11)
Level 4	17%	21%	18%
Level 3	26%	25%	24%
Level 2	33%	33%	30%
Level 1	23%	21%	28%

The findings presented in Table 4 provide evidence for the coherence of the score ranges across the three tests.

In order to compute a schools' tested readiness score, the school was assigned 20 points for each student at a school who performed at level 1, 50 points for each student who performed at level 2, 80 points for each student who performed at level 3 and 100 points for each student who performed at level 4. These index point values were assigned by the PJP in September 2013. A school received one overall tested readiness score for student performance on all tests from the ACT suite that were administered at the school. The school's tested readiness score was the mean index score for all students across all tests from this suite that were administered at the school.

Students who take the alternate assessment were included on the tested readiness subindicator. Alternate assessment students were included in the participation rate calculation. Tested readiness index scores for students who take the alternate assessment were based upon the percentage of subject area tests on which they were proficient or better. The number of alternate tests taken may vary for a variety of reasons. Students eligible for the alternate assessments may take anywhere from zero to four alternate assessments. Specifically, a school was assigned the index points associated with Level 4 (i.e., from Table 5) for each student who earns a proficient or better score on all subject area tests that they take. A school received index points associated with Level 3 for all students who earn a proficient or better score on between 66 percent to 75 percent of subject area tests they take on the alternate assessment. Some students may earn scores of proficient or better on 50% of subject area tests administered. When this happened the school was assigned the number of index points that was the average of the index points, rounded to the nearest whole number, associated with Level 2 and Level 3. This was equivalent to a Wyoming Tested Readiness Level of 2.5. Level 2.5 is only possible for students who take the alternate assessment. A school was assigned the index point associated with Level 2 for all students who were proficient or better on between 25% and 33% of the alternate assessment

subject area tests taken. Finally, A school was assigned the number of index points associated with Level 1 performance for all students who take the alternate assessment and are proficient or better none of subject area tests that they take.

Grade Nine Credits Earned. Grade nine may or may not be part of the grade configuration for all Wyoming schools from which students may receive a diploma. Some high schools serve students in grades ten through 12 while most presently serve students in grades nine through 12. Grade nine credits earned will be an indicator for all schools from which students may receive a diploma, regardless of the grade configuration of the school. The number of credits a student has when entering grade ten is a leading indicator for success in high school regardless of where the student attended school for grade nine. Therefore, high schools have an interest in and can choose to have some role in how well students are performing in grade nine even when grade nine is housed in a feeder school rather than in the high school itself.

Some students earn grade nine credits during a summer session. In order to be able to credit schools for ninth grade credits earned in the summer, the grade nine credits earned indicator will lag one year. In this respect it will be similar to the long standing practice in Wyoming of lagging the reporting of graduation rate for accountability purposes by one year so that students who graduate following the successful completion of required courses during the summer session may be included in a school's graduation rate.

When grade nine is housed at the high school, grade nine credits earned will be computed for all full academic year students enrolled at the school at the end of grade nine. When grade nine is housed in feeder schools, grade nine credits will be computed for all students who were full academic year students in a grade 9 paired school (i.e., a feeder school)[9]. Table 5 presents the list of high schools without a grade nine and their designated paired schools.

[9] A potential negative unintended consequence could be associated with this particular business rule. Specifically, a district may choose to retain students in grade nine in a junior high if they do not have all credits needed to be considered "on-track" for high school completion. An additional unintended consequence would be a practice of becoming more lenient about awarding credits in grade nine. A choice by the professional judgment panel to place less weight on this readiness indicator compared to the other readiness indicators could mitigate the likelihood of the potentially negative changes in practice.

Table 5. School Pairs for Grade 9 Credits during the 2012-13 School Year.

	Accountability School		Grade 9 Credits Earned School	
District	School #	School	School #	School
Albany #1	0101055	Laramie High School	0101050	Laramie Junior High School
			0101030	UW Laboratory School
			0101001	Snowy Range Academy
Fremont #21	0721055	Ft. Washakie Charter High School	0721056	Ft. Washakie High School
Fremont #21	0721056	Ft. Washakie High School	0721055	Ft. Washakie Charter High School
Campbell #1	0301055	Campbell County High School	0301050	Twin Spruce Junior High School
			0301051	Sage Valley Junior High School

A school's score for grade nine credits was the percentage of first year grade nine full academic year students that earned one fourth of the credits required to earn a diploma at their designated high school.

Hathaway Scholarship Level. There are four Hathaway scholarship levels in Wyoming. Eligibility for each level is based upon three criteria: (a) unweighted high school grade point average (GPA), (b) a minimum ACT or Work Keys score and (c) completion of the success curriculum at a particular level. For 2014 accountability, the scholarship levels used for school accountability will be based upon just two of the three eligibility criteria: the unweighted high school GPA and the minimum ACT score. These eligibility criteria are presented in Table 6. Changes have been made in the transcript collection process that will permit the use of all three Hathaway eligibility criteria in future years. For 2014 the student's Hathaway eligibility level for school accountability will be based upon a conjunctive model. Specifically, the level assigned to the student for the purpose of school accountability was the level associated with lower of the two indicators (i.e., unweighted GPA or minimum ACT score).

Table 6. Hathaway Scholarship Eligibility Levels and Criteria for Unweighted GPA and Best ACT Composite Score.

	Scholarship Level			
Criteria	Provisional	Opportunity	Performance	Honors
High School Minimum Unweighted GPA	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.5
Minimum ACT*	17**	19	21	25

*ACT can be the student's best ACT score which may not be from the census administration in grade 11.
**Or a WorkKeys score of at least 12.

The Hathaway success curriculum requirements for 2014 and beyond are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Hathaway Success Curriculum Requirements for 2014 Graduates and Beyond.

Hathaway Scholarship Level	Provisional Opportunity	Opportunity	Performance	Honors
Math	3 years of Hathaway Success Curriculum approved math; Must include two of the three, Algebra I, Algebra II and/or Geometry	4 years of Hathaway Success Curriculum approved math Must include Algebra I, Algebra II, Geometry and an approved additional math		
English/language arts	High school graduation requirements	4 years of Hathaway Success Curriculum approved English courses grades 9-12		
Science	High school graduation requirements	4 years of Hathaway Success Curriculum approved science courses grades 9-12		
Social Studies	High school graduation requirements	3 years of Hathaway Success Curriculum approved social studies courses grades 9-12		
Foreign Language	Meet foreign language proficiency as determined by your district (Excludes 2016 graduates and beyond)		2 sequenced years of approved foreign language courses; One year may be taken prior to grade nine	
Additional Success Curriculum Requirements for 2016 Graduates and Beyond				
Fine Arts	Fine Arts 2 years of fine and performing arts course grades 9-12			
OR				
Career and Technical Education	2 years of career and technical education courses grades 9-12			
OR				
Foreign Language	2 sequenced years of approved foreign language courses; One year may be taken prior to grade nine		2 additional years of foreign language courses may be sequenced or non-sequenced different language	

Hathaway Scholarship eligibility was measured using an index for the purpose of computing school performance levels under WAEA. The index is presented in Table 8. The school's score was the mean of student points for the graduating class at the school.

Table 8. Hathaway Scholarship Eligibility Index.

Student Eligibility Level	Points*
Level 5: Honors	100
Level 4: Performance	90
Level 3: Opportunity	80
Level 2: Provisional	70
Level 1: Not Eligible	0

**Initial index point values were derived from advisory committee to the Wyoming select committee on school accountability standard setting activity.

The Hathaway eligibility used for accountability will not necessarily match Hathaway eligibility for awards. For awards, a students' best ACT score can be used. The WDE Hathaway data collection may or may not include a student's best ACT score. In addition, a students' success curriculum performance may be monitored for verification by WDE using transcript information on a random basis or to address specific concerns. Actual success curriculum performance used for Hathaway awards and other eligibility criteria are judged by a human inspection of the student's transcript.

The final readiness score for high schools in 2014 was computed by multiplying each sub-indicator score at the school by the weight of that sub-indicator and then summing the weighted scores. Sub-indicator weights were established by the PJP. The PJP established the weight of the Hathaway subindicator as 40% and the weight of both tested readiness and grade nine credits earned at 30% each. The PJP then established cut scores for the three categories of below target, meeting target and exceeding target.

The growth cut points for grades high school other readiness sub-indicator were:

- Meets Target Cut Point = 70
- Exceeds Target Cut Point = 80

GRADE 3-8 SCHOOL PERFORMANCE LEVEL ASSIGNMENT

A decision table was used to identify the performance level for each school serving students in grades 3-8. The decision table has a cell that represents all possible combinations of target levels on the indicators. Each school's pattern of indicator target levels will be represented by a cell in the decision table. Each cell in the table is associated with a specific performance level (i.e., exceeds expectations, meets expectations, partially meets expectations and does not meet expectations). The performance level associated with each cell in the decision tables were established during the September 2014 standard setting meeting by the PJP[10]. The median of PJP member judgments for each cell on a second round of making judgments were used to identify the performance level associated with each cell. The decision tables are presented below.

[10] Some adjustments to the performance levels associated with the cells in the decision tables may be made by the PJP in 2014.

Table 9. Decision Table for Assigning School Performance Levels for Schools with Grades Three through Eight that have Three Indicators.

		Achievement Below	Achievement Meeting	Achievement Exceeding
Equity Below	Growth Below	NOT	PARTIALLY	PARTIALLY
	Growth Meeting	PARTIALL	MEETING	MEETING
	Growth Exceeding	PARTIALLY	MEETING	MEETING
Equity Meeting	Growth Below	PARTIALLY	MEETING	MEETING
	Growth Meeting	PARTIALLY	MEETING	EXCEEDING
	Growth Exceeding	PARTIALLY	MEETING	EXCEEDING
Equity Exceeding	Growth Below	PARTIALLY	MEETING	MEETING
	Growth Meeting	PARTIALLY	MEETING	EXCEEDING
	Growth Exceeding	PARTIALLY	EXCEEDING	EXCEEDING

There will be some schools that have only two indicators. For example, many schools did not have a consolidated subgroup that met the minimum *n* requirement. These schools did not have an equity indicator. When schools had only two indicators the decision tables below was used for determining the school performance level.

Table 10. Decision Table for Assigning School Performance Levels when a School with Grades Three through Eight has Only Two Indicators.

	Achievement Below	Achievement Meeting	Achievement Exceeding
Growth Below	NOT	PARTIALLY	MEETING
Growth Meeting	PARTIALLY	MEETING	EXCEEDING
Growth Exceeding	PARTIALLY	MEETING	EXCEEDING

HIGH SCHOOL PERFORMANCE LEVEL ASSIGNMENT

Each school's performance on the achievement, equity and readiness indicators was used to determine a school's performance level. Three decision tables were used for this purpose. Table 11 presents the first decision table that was used to establish whether the school exceeded targets, met targets or was below targets on tested achievement and equity. The PJP assigned the cell decision determinations.

Table 11. Achievement and Equity Target Level Decision Table.

	Achievement Below Target	Achievement Meets Target	Achievement Exceeds Target
Equity Below Target	BELOW	BELOW	MEETING
Equity Meets Target	MEETING	MEETING	EXCEEDING
Equity Exceeds Target	MEETING	MEETING	EXCEEDING

Table 12 presents the second decision table that was used to establish whether the school was exceeding targets, meeting targets or below targets on the readiness sub-indicators. The PJP assigned the cell decision determinations.

Table 12. Overall Readiness Decision Table.

	Grad Rate Below Target	Grad Rate Meets Target	Grad Rate Exceeds Target
Additional Readiness Below Target	BELOW	BELOW	MEETING
Additional Readiness Meets Target	MEETING	MEETING	EXCEEDING
Additional Readiness Exceeds Target	MEETING	EXCEEDING	EXCEEDING

Finally, Table 13 present the decision table for the determining the overall performance level of the schools. Each school's target levels from the achievement and equity decision table and from the overall readiness decision table was entered into the school performance level decision table. The PJP determined which of the four school performance levels (i.e., exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, partially meeting expectations and not meeting expectations was applied to each cell in this decision table.

Table 13. School Performance Level Decision Table.

	Achievement & Equity Not Meet	Achievement & Equity Meets	Achievement & Equity Exceeds
Readiness Not Meets	NOT	PARTIALLY	MEETING
Readiness Meets	PARTIALLY	MEETING	MEETING
Readiness Exceeds	PARTIALLY	MEETING	EXCEEDING

Schools that met the minimum *n* on at least two of the three high school indicators (i.e., achievement, equity or readiness) received a performance level based upon the available indicators. Schools that met the minimum *n* indicator on zero or one indicator only will be considered small schools and will undergo a small school review.

STUDENTS INCLUDED IN STATE ACCOUNTABILITY

Students included in state accountability at a particular school were those who districts have reported with an active primary enrollment on the accountability date for a particular test under consideration (e.g., PAWS, ACT). Primary enrollment means a student was reported by the district (on the WDE684) as “no” in both the home school and concurrent enrollment fields. When a student is reported as “yes” in either of these fields it means the student is primarily home schooled or primarily enrolled at another school. Students can only have one “primary” enrollment.

PARTICIPATION RATE

Rules for minimum participation rate are important to assure that test results used as accountability indicators are representative of the performance of students receiving instruction at a school. Nonparticipation in testing is unlikely to be randomly distributed among students attending a school. Nonparticipation is more likely to be systematic. When a sample of non participants in testing at a school is systematic (e.g., when the students who are nonparticipants are those likely to have low test scores), selection bias occurs and the validity associated with using those scores in school performance computations is called into question (Marion & Domaleski, 2012). The accountability conclusions about school performance will not match actual school performance.

Participation rate is computed for (a) all enrolled students and (b) all enrolled students in the current year consolidated subgroup. As a group these are students with high needs and it is important that they not be systematically excluded from testing. In the case of small schools where look backs to previous years are used to increase the school's *n* count, participation rate will be based upon current year students only.

All schools are expected to meet the minimum annual participation rate of 95 percent for both student groups. When a school fails to meet the minimum participation rate on all tests involved in computing school performance levels the school will be assigned to the school performance level that is one level below the computed performance level.

Any school that fails to meet an annual participation rate of at least 90 percent on any test that is used in the assignment of Wyoming school performance levels will be declared “unscoreable”. Schools that are unscoreable will be assigned the school performance level of not meeting expectations.

Exemptions

In rare instances, districts may petition the Wyoming Department of Education for an exemption from testing for students with the most significant cognitive disability who are assessed on the alternate assessment when they move into the school from another school district after the beginning of the alternate assessment window. Students moving between schools within a district are not eligible for an exemption. Eligibility for an exemption should not be based on the disability category, the amount of time for which the students receives service, the location or delivery of service or the level of functioning of the student.

The Wyoming Department of Education will consider the amount of time left in the testing window to prepare for and administer the assessment. There must be evidence that the amount of time left in the testing window is not adequate to allow for a valid administration. The Wyoming Department of Education may consider evidence about the individual student’s response time when demonstrating academic knowledge if such evidence is provided. For approved exemptions the performance of the student is not considered in participation rate computations or in school performance level computations.

Testing Status

- Testing status values (by subject):
  - X = Exempt: The student has an approved exemption from this subject (or a pending exemption where ELL is the exemption type), as discussed in the "Exemption Type" section below.
  - T = Tested: The student has been reported by ETS to have taken the test free of any conditions expected to invalidate the test. That is, a valid scale score and proficiency level will be reported later this summer for this student and subject.
  - N = Not Tested: The student does not have a valid test result. In most cases, this will simply mean the student was not tested. One particular case, discussed in the "Grade Enrolled (WDE684 collection) vs. Grade Tested (ETS)" section below, is that where a student has been tested in a different grade than reported as enrolled.

Exemption Types

- **Exemption Type**
  - If you have requested an exemption from testing for a student and the exemption has been approved, the exemption type will be reported (e.g. ELL, Medical, etc.).
  - ELL exemptions require ACCESS testing of the student.
  - ELL exemptions only apply to the reading portion of the assessment.

Grade Tested

- **Grade Enrolled (WDE684 collection) vs. Grade Tested (Test Contractor)**
  - Grade Enrolled, Grade Tested, and a comparison field will be reported.
  - Where a student has tested, but was reported as enrolled in a different grade than tested, the comparison field will indicate a grade mismatch AND the testing status value will be N (Not Tested).
    - If the district determines that the student was tested at the proper grade level and that the reported WDE684 grade was incorrect the district may correct this discrepancy during the WDE684 vetting period

ONE PERCENT ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT CAP

Wyoming is imposing a 1% district-level cap on the percent of enrolled students in tested grades whose proficient and advanced scores on an alternate assessment count in school accountability calculations. This cap does not serve to limit the percent of students who participate in an alternate assessment or the percent of students who can earn a score of proficient/advanced;

rather, the cap is placed on the proficient/advanced scores that "count" in calculating the school performance levels under WAEA.

For example, in a district with 500 students enrolled in tested grades, staff could test, say, 10 students with significant cognitive disabilities using the ALT, assuming the test is appropriate for the students. If 7 of the 10 earned scores of proficient and advanced, the 1% rule dictates that only the scores of 5 ALT-takers (5/500 = 1%) can be used in calculating AYP on the reading and math indicators. The remaining two scores are randomly reassigned as "basic" only for purposes of calculating WAEA school performance levels, and they are displayed in the field called ACCOUNTABILITY_PERFORMANCE_LEVEL in the confidential student level data file available to districts on Fusion.

It's important to note that the actual scores the students earn, regardless of the 1% cap, are printed on the Individual Score Report and returned to the district in their Fusion assessment files (and should be uploaded to district Student Information Systems). Students are not in any way penalized with the cap.

Districts that exceed the 1% cap can request an exemption by submitting the WDE 659 form and appropriate documentation. When a district submits evidence that the students were assigned the ALT per an IEP team decision based on participation in alternate curricula, then an exemption from the cap is granted. Evidence is required for all ALT participants in the district, not just for the number of students who bumped the percent over the cap.

This year, since the test scores will be delivered to districts in the early fall because of PAWS standard-setting, the WDE 659 will not be due until mid-September.

TRANSCRIPT COLLECTIONS

Two transcript collections are used for the high school readiness sub-indicators. One sub-indicator requiring transcripts is *ninth grade credits* and the other is *Hathaway scholarship eligibility*. It is expected that transcripts will be available for all students on the Wyoming Department of Education developed roster of students to be included on these indicators.

- Students included on the WDE developed rosters will be:
    - Transcripts for Grade 9 Credits – Full academic year students at the designated school who were continuously enrolled from October 1st through the end of the school year. This will include any student with an exit date within 10 days of the final day of the school year.
    - Transcripts for Hathaway Eligibility Level – This will include all students who were counted as graduates for the year in question when computing graduation rates. This includes all students who graduated between September 15th one year and September 14th the following year.

The absence of transcripts for included students can alter a school's score on an indicator. For example, a pattern of systematic exclusion of transcripts at some schools but not at others would raise the issue of fairness, particularly if some exclusion were systematic for students that would

have a negative impact on a particular school's score. For this reason, the following transcript inclusion rule will be applied to both transcript collections.

- For the grade nine credit indicator, students for whom a transcript is missing will be considered to have not earned 1/4th of the credits required for high school graduation in grade nine.
- For the Hathaway eligibility indicator, students for whom a transcript is missing will be considered to not have been eligible for any level of Hathaway eligibility award.

Both of these sub-indicators are lagged, meaning that data from the prior year are applied to the current year's indicator. This is done to permit the summer progress that students make to be counted. For example, the school performance level for the 2013-14 school year will use grade nine credits and Hathaway eligibility from the 2012-13 school year.

FULL ACADEMIC YEAR

Student mobility varies across schools. Students sometimes move into a school just prior to testing. When computing school performance levels, it is reasonable to include only students who were present at the school for a full academic year (Marion & Domaleski, 2012). "Full academic year" will be defined for Wyoming accountability as being enrolled in the same school on October 1 and on the day that is the midpoint of the testing window for each test used in the computation of school performance levels. Students who were not at the school for the full academic year will be excluded from school performance level computations.

For the grade nine credit sub-indicator, full academic year status is defined as being continuously enrolled from October 1st of the given school year until ten days from the last day of the school year in the school they are attending.

Most small (< 10 day) gaps in enrollments reported out of student information systems have been identified as being due to reporting requirements and system related administrative reasons. Thus, in automated processes, these small breaks do not constitute an immediate break-in-enrollment unless an enrollment record exists in a different school during the short break. Identification of students as mobile or full academic year also has significant funding implications, which were addressed with WDE Finance and the School Finance Data Advisory Committee in the development of status determination processes. As such, there may be cases where challenge of an automated status determination will make sense. Challenges will be evaluated individually based on enrollment details to be provided as a part of the challenge.

Home schooled and concurrent enrollment students are not included in accountability calculations.

MINIMUM *n* FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

Beginning with the 2013-14 school year, the minimum *n* will be 10 students for all indicators. A look back will occur independently for each indicator at a school that does not meet the minimum *n.* For high schools it will not be possible to look back on the equity indicator in 2013-

14. On the high school achievement indicator and tested readiness sub-indicator it will only be possible to look back one year in 2013-14. The minimum *n* look back procedure is to first look back one year and see if the minimum *n* is reached. If the minimum *n* is not reached with a one year look back, the look back will go back a second year. If the minimum *n* is still not reached for more than one indicator, the school will undergo the *small school review* process.

Any student tested in reading, math, or reading and math will be counted to determine the schools *n.* No student will be counted more than once.

SMALL SCHOOL DEFINITION AND PROCEDURES

A school will be considered a small school when the school does not have at least ten students on at least two of the WAEA indicators. To put it another way, in order for a school to be assigned a school performance level without using small school procedures, the school must meet the minimum *n* of ten students on at least two indicators. Procedures for a small school review are included as Appendix C.

SCHOOLS WITH ONE OR NO TESTED GRADES

There are schools in Wyoming with grade three as their only tested grade. When schools have grade three as their only tested grade, they have an achievement indicator, but they do not have data for the growth indicator or the equity indicator. For the purpose of accountability these schools are "paired" with the school their students feed into after grade three that includes a grade four. This ensures school performance levels are based upon more than just one indicator. The grade three achievement scores from these schools are combined with the achievement scores from their paired school when determining school performance levels. In other words, the combined school is treated as a single school for accountability.

In Wyoming there are schools with grade configurations that do not include any tested grade. For example, several LEAs have organized their elementary schools so that students attend grade K-2 in one building and then move to a different building for grades 3-5. In this case, the school performance level for the 3-5 school is used to hold the K-2 school accountable as well. The rationale for this is that the teachers in the two different schools need to be communicating across buildings to plan their curricular and instructional sequences for the successful transition of students between schools. Holding both schools equally accountable for the 3-5 school results should help foster this communication.

Table 14 is a list of Wyoming schools that do not contain any of the currently assessed grades and the school with which they are paired for accountability purposes. This table will be updated each year.

Table 14. Accountability School Pairings for Schools without Tested Grades.

School ID	School Name	Grades Served	Accountability Related School	Grades Served	School ID
0501002	Douglas Primary School	K-1	Douglas Upper Elementary School	4-5	0501010
0501013	Douglas Intermediate	2-3			
0701007	North Elementary &	K-1	Baldwin Creek Elementary	4-5	0701009
0701008	Gannett Peak Elementary	2-3			
0706001	Crowheart Elementary	K-3	Wind River Elementary	K-5	0706002
0725001	Ashgrove Elementary School	K-2	Rendezvous Elementary	3-5	0725007
0725005	Aspen Park Elementary School	K-2			
0725003	Jackson Elementary School	K-2			
0801007	Lincoln Elementary	K-2	Trail Elementary	3-5	0801006
1001006	Meadowlark Elementary	K-3	Clear Creek Elementary	4-5	1001002
1101021	Lebhart Elementary	K-2	Fairview Elementary	3-6	1101013
1101010	Deming Elementary	K-3	Miller Elementary	4-6	1101022
1202001	Afton Elementary	K-3	Osmond Elementary	4-6	1202005
1202003	Thayne Elementary	K-3	Etna Elementary	4-6	1202004
1601003	Libbey Elementary	K-2	West Elementary	3-5	1601005
2001010	Jackson Elementary	K-2	Colter Elementary	3-5	2001009
2104001	Mountain View Elementary	K-2	Fort Bridger Elementary	3-5	2104002
2301003	Newcastle Elementary	K-2	Gertrude Burns Intermediate	3-5	2301001

APPENDIX A

COMPUTING "AGP" – Technical Documentation

- From SGP Package in R
  - Obtain "Lagged" Projections
    - Projections are the SGPs needed to remain within or get to a particular performance level on a future test
    - Lagged indicates that projections were based upon the prior year's test
      - As such the YEAR_1 projection is a projection of the SGP needed this year to assure a particular performance level
      - YEAR_2 projection is a projection of the SGP needed to assure a particular performance level in the year after the current year and so on
  - A student's prior year performance level is not considered in the computation of the lagged projections
  - There are 3 levels of projections
    - LEVEL_1 projections give the SGP needed to remain/become Basic
    - LEVEL_2 projections give the SGP needed to remain/become Proficient
    - LEVEL_3 projections five the SGP needed to remain/become Advanced

- SGP_TARGETS were obtained from SGP Package. (The SGP target for a given year is the SGP needed in the current year to become/remain proficient in the current year or a given future year)
  - Lagged projections from SGP Package
    - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_1
      - SGP needed in the current year to become/remain proficient
    - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_2
      - SGP needed in the next year to become/remain proficient
    - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_3
      - SGP needed in 2 years to become/remain proficient
    - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_4
      - SGP needed in 3 years to become/remain proficient
  - Lagged projections from SGP Package were used to compute SGP_TARGETS for the CURRENT_YEAR, YEAR_1, YEAR_2 and YEAR_3

Work below here is completed in the Wyoming Department of Education Oracle data base.

- CUKU_TARGETS (Catch Up Keep Up) take into consideration the proficiency status of the student on the prior year's test were as lagged projection do not take this into consideration
  - CUKU_TARGET_CURRRENT_YEAR

        - This equals the LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_1 for all students
    - CUKU_TARGET_YEAR_1
        - For below proficient students is the *lowest* of:
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_1
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_2
        - For proficient and above students is the *highest* of:
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_1
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_2
    - CUKU_TARGET_YEAR_2
        - For below proficient students is the lowest of:
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_1
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_2
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_3
        - For proficient and above students is the highest of:
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_1
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_2
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_3
    - CUKU_TARGET_YEAR_3
        - For below proficient students is the lowest of:
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_1
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_2
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_3
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_4
        - For proficient and above students is the highest of:
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_1
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_2
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_3
            - LEVEL_2_SGP_TARGET_YEAR_4

- AGP (Adequate Growth Percentile) by grade
    - Is the CUKU_TARGET_CURRENT_YEAR for grade 8 students
    - Is the CUKU_TARGET_YEAR_1 for grade 7 students
    - Is the CUKU_TARGET_YEAR_2 for grade 6 students
    - Is the CUKU_TARGET_YEAR_3 for grade 4 & grade 5 students

- MET_AGP
    - True if SGP – AGP ≥ 0
    - False if SGP – AGP < 0

APPENDIX B

2014 Performance Level Descriptors for Schools with Grades 3-8

Exceeding Expectations
This category is reserved for schools considered models of performance. These schools typically exceeded target for achievement and for at least one other performance indicator - equity or growth – while meeting target on the other indicator.

Meeting Expectations
Schools in this category demonstrated performance that met or exceeded target on multiple performance indicators. These schools typically had levels of achievement meeting or exceeding state targets, and met or exceeded targets on student growth and promotion of equity for students with below-Proficient achievement or fell below target on growth or equity while exceeding target on achievement.

Partially Meeting Expectations
Schools in this category performed below target on multiple performance indicators *or* were below target in achievement. Many schools in this category showed acceptable or higher performance in student growth *and/or* promoting equity for below-Proficient students.

Not Meeting Expectations
Schools in this category had unacceptable performance on all indicators. For schools in this category, improvement is an urgent priority. These schools had below-target levels of achievement and student growth and showed insufficient improvement for below-Proficient achievers.

2014 Performance Level Descriptors for High Schools

Exceeding Expectations
This category is reserved for schools considered models of performance. These schools exceeded state target for overall readiness for college and careers *and* for the performance indicator combining the school's achievement and equity.

Meeting Expectations
Schools in this category demonstrated performance that met or exceeded target on multiple performance indicators. All of these schools performed at levels that met or exceeded target on the combined indicator for achievement and equity. Their performance met or exceeded target in overall readiness *or* exceeded target in the achievement/equity indicator while being below target in overall readiness.

Partially Meeting Expectations
Schools in this category typically performed below target on the indicator combining achievement and equity. Some schools met state target for achievement/equity, but were below target in overall readiness for college and careers.

Not Meeting Expectations
Schools in this category had unacceptable performance on all indicators. For schools in this category, improvement is an urgent priority. These schools typically had low levels of achievement, showed below-target levels of change in the performance of below-Proficient students, *and* fell short of targets in overall readiness for college and careers.

APPENDIX C

WYOMING SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY

SMALL SCHOOL REVIEW PROCESS

(draft – 12/09/13)

SMALL SCHOOL DEFINITION

Wyoming has many very small schools. At times there are schools in Wyoming that have just one student. For the purpose of this small school review process a school will be considered a small school when the school is unable to meet the minimum *n* requirement on more than one indicator. If a school is able to meet the minimum *n* indicator on two or three indicators by implementing look back procedures the school will not be considered a small school. Look back procedures involve aggregating data for multiple years as a way to increase the *n* count at a school.

Beginning with the 2013-14 minimum *n* look back will occur independently for each indicator at a school that does not meet the minimum *n*. The minimum *n* will be 10 students for all indicators. The minimum *n* look back procedure is to first look back one year and see if the minimum *n* is reached. If the minimum *n* is not reached with a one year looked back, the look back will go back a second year. If the minimum *n* is still not reached, the school will undergo the *small school review* process.

In addition, some schools with no indicators or just one indicator can logically be paired with a school to which their students eventually attend. The example here is a school serving students in grades kindergarten through grade two. This school would not have any indicators for accountability. Nearly all students from this school may, however, feed into another school that serves grades three through five. In this example the kindergarten through grade two school is paired with the grades three through five school and both schools share the performance level established based upon the three through five school indicator performance. It's conceivable that a kindergarten through grade two school might feed students into many schools, however. In this case the school would be appropriate for a small school review. Details about which schools are paired for school accountability was presented above.

PURPOSE OF SMALL SCHOOL REVIEWS

By definition, small schools lack standardized and stable data to inform a comparable school performance level determination. Therefore, the objective of a small school review is to review any applicable information and evidence that the school can produce to inform judgments about the extent of support and improvement the school may require.

OPERATIONAL DETAILS

- An accountability review team at the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) will complete the review. WDE has had a review team in place for several years to review federal school accountability decisions. This same team will complete the small school reviews.
- Upon completing the review, the review team will forward recommendations to the State Board of Education.

- Timeline for submission and review will be as follows:
    - Schools will be notified by October 1st if the school is deemed a "small school."
    - By November 1st, schools must submit a school improvement plan via the ASSIST platform.
    - The WDE review team will read the school improvement plan.
        - If no additional information is required, the WDE review team will determine the outcome of the review and notify the school.
        - If additional information pertaining to the accountability indicators is needed, the WDE will make a request to the school by November 15th.
            - The school shall submit additional information pertaining to indicators by December 1st.
            - The WDE review team will review additional evidence provided by the school, determine the outcome of the review, and notify the school of the outcome by December 15th.

EVIDENCE PROVIDED BY THE SCHOOL

School improvement plans are presently due on November 1st each year. The department of education has access to these school improvement plans. These plans will be reviewed as part of the small school review. The attached school improvement plan review rubric will be used for reviewing the school improvement plans. This rubric provides guidance to the schools about the criteria that will be used in judging the improvement plans.

Schools serving students in grades three through eight may submit additional evidence relevant to the following indicators (e.g., evidence from Measures of Academic Progress [MAP]):

- Achievement
- Growth
- Equity
- Other relevant evidence

Schools serving students in high school grades may submit additional evidence relevant to the following indicators (e.g., evidence from ACT testing outside of the grade 11 census administration):

- Achievement
- Readiness (College and Career)
- Equity
- Other relevant evidence

The Department team conducting the review may consider the achievement evidence for small numbers of students or individual student if requested to do so by the school. Any public report prepared by the Department review team must not reveal any personally identifiable student performance information.

OUTCOMES OF A REVIEW

- Approved – The process is complete once a school gets this outcome
- Approved with Recommendations – The process is complete once a school gets this outcome
- Revise and Resubmit – additional support to the school may be required or made available when a school gets this outcome

In order for a school to be granted “approved” status it should receive a minimum rating of acceptable on all reviewed elements.